

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Public Law 106-393

Title II Project Submission Form

Northeast Oregon Forests Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by Designated Federal Official): WA-WAW05-001

2. Project Name: Upper Joseph Watershed Assessment (Community Natural Resource Planning Process)	3. County: Wallowa
4. Project Sponsors: Bruce Dunn, WC Natural Resource Advisory Council Chair, Meg Mitchell, Forest Service District Ranger	5. Date: 4/15/02
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: Bruce Dunn- 426-6019; Meg Mitchell- 426-5581	
7. Sponsors E-mail: bdunn@eoni.com ; mmitchell01@fs.fed.us	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #: Lower Grande Ronde	
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC # (if known): Upper Joseph Creek	
c. Location: Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____	
d. BLM District	e. BLM Resource Area
f. National Forest Wallowa-Whitman	g. Forest Service Unit: Wallowa Mountain Zone
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives: (max. 7 lines)
The Upper Joseph Watershed Assessment is an on-going community planning process designed to define land restoration principles and build consensus among various interested parties and organizations. We seek to identify the highest watershed management, and monitoring priorities in the next 5-7 years for upland and aquatic restoration, forest/rangeland health and roads/recreation management within the Upper Joseph watershed. Implementation of these priorities will begin in 2003 and continue for the next 5-7 years.

10. Project Description: (max. 30 lines.)
Currently there are four sub-groups (forest health, range/grassland health, watershed, and roads/recreation) working on inventory and assessment work on both public and private lands within the watershed. These groups consist of a diverse range of interests and people and are coordinated by the local Wallowa County Natural Resource Advisory Committee. Each group's work is facilitated by Wallowa Resources or the Grande Model Watershed. The Forest Service is providing technical assistance and support. This project has several partners who have contributed funds for on-going

inventory and assessment work within the watershed on both public and private lands. This request seeks funds to complete the watershed assessment, conduct community meetings and peer/science reviews, and issue a report this winter that will identify the specific project priorities for management. Several of these projects will then be evaluated under the NEPA process if they occur on public lands. Private land projects will be proposed by landowners and implemented as sources of funding are identified. Title II funds will support these activities (Phase I) and some of the participation of cooperating agencies in the NEPA process, who will supply analysis (Phase II). Wallowa County has expressed interest in being a cooperating agency to the USFS lead agency. Additional cooperating agencies may include the State of Oregon, Tribes and other federal agencies such as NMFS and FWS.

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?

X Yes ☐ No **If yes, then describe** (max. 10 lines)

The Upper Joseph assessment is an entire watershed assessment approach and includes both private and public lands. Much of the headwaters of this watershed are private land, making this watershed somewhat unique in the landscape. It is even more important that the restorative and management treatments proposed consider the interconnecting systems within the entire watershed.

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

X Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]

X Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

☐ Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]

☐ Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]

☐ Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]

☐ Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

☐ Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

☐ Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]

☐ Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]

X Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]: **Supports community-based planning process and consensus building that will identify future projects that will include road maintenance, road decommissioning, watershed restoration, fish habitat restoration, native species reestablishment, forest and grassland health improvement, wildlife habitat restoration and control of noxious weeds.**

14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]

a. Total Acres: 170,000 assessed

b. Total Miles:

c. No. Structures:

d. Est. People Reached
(for environmental education projects):

e. No. Laborer Days:

f. Other (specify):

15. Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)]

Phase I Activities (Watershed Assessment/ Report)- January 2003

Phase II Activities (NEPA, Project Design)- On-going, all NEPA projects completed by April 2004

Phase III Activities (Implementation)- On-going (see Upper Joseph Instream proposal) 2003-2009

Note- Various phases run concurrently and overlap.

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable) (max. 7 lines)

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved?

[Sec. 2(b)(3)] (max. 12 lines)

By cooperatively identifying restoration principles with other agencies, environmental groups, citizens, non-profits and private land owners and practicing these principles by working together to identify and implement projects on federal lands. Cooperating agencies will assist the federal land managers in evaluating and disclosing the effects under the NEPA process. Cooperators will help implement and monitor the success of projects implemented. By taking a watershed approach environmental interactions between public and private lands will be better understood and managed.

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] **Identify benefits to communities.**
(max. 12 lines)

This project is designed to build on the existing level of community capacity in Wallowa County to work together to identify and solve natural resource problems by implementing projects that are in the broad national public interest; generating clean water, healthy forests and rangelands and recreation access on public lands. In addition this effort will encourage and assist private land owners wishing to do the same. The on-going assessment has already made use of local contractors, facilitators and leaders and natural resource based skills within the community. The support of Title II funds will continue to build on this success.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources? (max. 12 lines)

The project will generate a list of well thought out, proposed land management priorities on the National Forest that have broad based support to improve roads/recreation opportunities and watershed, range/grassland and forest health. The project is expected to provide for greater efficiencies in evaluating specific federal proposals under the NEPA process. Projects will be implemented in a coordinated fashion, which will take advantage of a variety of funding sources. Once projects are implemented, many will have direct benefits to public lands including projects implemented on private lands at the head of the watershed (e.g. better coordinated weed control, riparian restoration and other projects that cross ownership boundaries). Community based monitoring will provide feedback to the agency and the cooperators within the watershed itself. Wallowa County, cooperators and Forest Service hope to repeat this learning process in other watersheds.

20. Status of Project Planning

a. NEPA Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	X No	N/A for Phase I
If no, give est. date of completion: By April 2004			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	X No	N/A for Phase I
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	X No	N/A for Phase I

e. Survey & Manage Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	X Not Applicable
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	X No	X N/A for Phase I
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	X No	X N/A for Phase I
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	X No	X N/A for Phase I
i. Project Design(s) Completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	X No	X N/A for Phase I
* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer			

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment (<i>check those that apply</i>)	
X Contract	X Federal Workforce
X County Workforce	X Volunteers
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):	

22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)]

☐ Yes X No

Not in Phase I. However subsequent phases are expected to generate some merchantable materials.

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$43,200 in FY 03	
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, then display by fiscal year	
c. FY02 Request:	f. FY05 Request: \$40,000 (Phase III)
d. FY03 Request: \$43,200 (Phase I, Begin Phase II)	g. FY06 Request: \$40,000 (Phase III)
e. FY04 Request: \$40,000 (Phase II, Begin Phase III)	Note: Each year Wallowa County will submit a report on progress and more specific proposal for that year's expenditures.

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

2003 REQUEST Item	<i>Column A</i> Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	<i>Column B</i> Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	<i>Column C</i> Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	<i>Column D</i> Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys	\$30,000		\$60,000	\$90,000
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation				
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering				
28. Contract Preparation	\$1,000		\$2,000	\$3,000
29. Contract Administration	\$2,000		\$3,000	\$5,000
30. Contract Cost			\$74,000	\$74,000
31. Workforce Cost	\$12,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$62,000
32. Materials & Supplies			\$80,000	\$80,000
33. Monitoring			\$20,000	\$20,000
34. Other: writing editing, community meetings, evaluation panels		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$40,000
35. Project Sub-Total	\$45,000	\$40,000	\$289,000	
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8.0%) (per year for multi-year projects)	\$ 3,600	\$ 3,200		\$6,800
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$48,600	\$43,200	\$289,000	\$380,800

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)] (max. 7 lines)

- Wallowa Resources- \$20,000
- USFS Grant to Wallowa County (Adminstered by Wallowa Resources)- \$129,000 for vegetation inventory and assessment
- The Nature Conservancy- \$100,000 for satelight imagery and field verification of grassland plots
- Grande Model Watershed- \$40,000 (not yet secured)

39. Monitoring Plan [Sec. 203(b)(6)]

- a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] (max. 7 lines)
Who is responsible for this monitoring item?:

The Grande Ronde Model Watershed and USFS are helping identify direct indicators or surrogate indicators of success for future restoration efforts (particularly watershed health). Other indicators of community health and sustainability will be tied to local efforts to help identify these nationally (LUCID, NEOCAW) by Wallowa Resources and the County. The Upper Joseph watershed is a unique opportunity to test the utility of the hierarchy of indicators.

- b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] (max. 7 lines)
Who is responsible for this monitoring item?:

Specific contracts, employment opportunities and project accomplishments for the Upper Joseph planning, implementation and monitoring process will be tracked by the Local Natural Resource Advisory Committee with assistance from the US Forest Service and Wallowa Resources.

- c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act?** [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] (max. 7 lines)
Who is responsible for this monitoring item?:

Wallowa Resources and the Forest Service will work together to determine measures of evaluation and monitor how well proposed projects utilize or add value to any products removed from National Forest Lands in Phase III (Implementation).

- d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33)**
(max. 7 lines)
Amount \$20,000

County Commissioner Concurrence

(Majority Required per charter)

A majority of the county commissioners of Wallowa County have reviewed this proposed Public Law 106-393 project for the Northeast Oregon Resources Advisory Council and agree with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

(See attached letter from County Commissioners)

Attested by Commissioner

Date

Priority Rating: **Wallowa County Rank #1 Project**

X High ☐ Medium ☐ Low

Comments/Rational: